

**REMARKS**

Claims 56-87 are pending. Claims 1-55 have been canceled.

Claims 62-64, 71, 72 and 78-81 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 31 and 32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,414. Applicants do not believe that any of claims 62-64, 71, 72 or 78-81 are obvious variations of claims 31 or 32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,414. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution of the present application, Applicants attach a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). Thus, the rejection of claims 62-64, 71, 72 and 78-81 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting should be withdrawn.

Claims 56-87 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by "A Method\* For Fast IPv4 and IPv4 CIDR Address Translation and Filtering Using the MUSIC WidePort LANCAM®, LANCAM®, and LANCAM® 1st Family," dated January 1998 ("LANCAM"). Claims 56-87 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by "Fast IPv4 and IPv4 CIDR Address Translation and Filtering Using the MUAC™ Routing Coprocessor (RCP)," dated January 1998 ("MUAC").

Applicants herewith submits an Inventor's Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 declaring that (1) the subject matter of both LANCAM and MUAC relevant to the claims (Relevant Subject Matter) was derived from the Applicants, and (2) the Applicants actually invented the Relevant Subject Matter. Accordingly, neither LANCAM nor MUAC is prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a). Therefore, the rejection of claims 56-87 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) should be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: February 15, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorney for Applicant